



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/680,761	10/07/2003	Peter T. Stern	MSFT10	5223

27488 7590 04/27/2006

MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, KEVIN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2629

DATE MAILED: 04/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/680,761	Applicant(s) STERN, PETER T.	
	Examiner Kevin M. Nguyen	Art Unit 2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 October 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: 215, 220, and 225 of figure 2. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1 and 8 are objected to because of the following informalities:
claim 1, line 7, the word "may" should be deleted

claim 8, line 1, after the word "claim", insert --1--

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sutton (US 6,595,781) in view of Glaser (US 6,072,463).

5. As to claim 1, Sutton discloses a system for providing an interactive collaborative display in an educational environment [see abstract, a first embodiment of Fig. 2], the system comprising:

a processing unit [a computer 4, Fig. 2];

a data storage unit, operable for storing a plurality of instructions for the processing unit [a storage device, 8, Fig. 2];

a large format collaboration display [a large display screen 5, Fig. 2];

wherein the large format collaboration display [5] displays a plurality of documents [educational content notes have been written on the digitizing board 5 and 3, col. 8, lines 31-42] and accept simultaneous input from a plurality of users in the documents [other input devices shown in Fig. 2 will be activated (and their outputs

stored) in synchronism only during selected periods during the educational presentation, col. 9, lines 7-11].

Accordingly, Sutton discloses all of the claimed limitation, except wherein accept simultaneous input from a plurality of users in at least on of the plurality of documents.

However, Glaser discloses a conventional work area which serves as a video "whiteboard" on which user can share information during a conference [see col. 1, lines 31-33]. All of the conference participants can have mouse/pointer icons simultaneously active and present in the common work area of the conference window [see col. 1, line 67 through col. 2, line 3].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement all of the conference participants can have pointer icons simultaneously active and present in the common work area of the conference window as conventionally disclosed by Glaser for the intended use of the computer-based education system of Sutton in order to achieve the benefit of permitting users to communicate via display screen and simultaneously point to areas of all the user screens (see Glaser, col. 1, lines 10-13).

6. As to claim 7, Sutton discloses the system of claim 1, further comprising a communications unit, operable for transmitting and receiving content over a distributed network [see a second embodiment of Fig. 3, col. 10, lines 57-62. It is noted that the second embodiment of Fig. 3 incorporated into the first embodiment of Fig. 2, col. 10, lines 25-34].

Art Unit: 2629

7. As to claim 8, Sutton discloses the system of claim 1 further comprising a plurality of educational application programs supporting educational standards selected from the list consisting essentially of K-12 Extensible Markup Language (XML) schema [Hyper-Text Markup Language (HLML), col. 14, lines 1-19. It is noted that XML and HTML are the same, see http://www.reference.com/browse/wiki/Standard_Generalized_Markup_Language].

8. Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sutton in view of Glaser as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ogino et al (US 5,818,421) hereinafter Ogino.

As to claim 2, the combination of Sutton and Glaser discloses all of the claimed limitation of claim 1, except wherein the large format display comprises a resistive touch screen overlay.

However, Ogino discloses a large screen display which includes a conductive resistor film is added onto a light-transmission screen (see col. 5, lines 10-13). Ogino further discloses his present invention applying to a projection type LCD display (see col. 5, lines 27-34).

As to claim 3, Ogino discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the large format collaboration display is selected from a list consisting essentially of a liquid crystal display (LCD). See col. 5, lines 27-33, disclosing, the present invention can be applied to a liquid crystal panel.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the display of Sutton and Glaser to become the liquid

Art Unit: 2629

crystal panel including the resistive touch screen as disclosed by Ogino in order to achieve the benefit of improving the position pointing being touched more precise (see Ogino, col. 5, lines 43-45).

9. Claims 3, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sutton in view of Glaser as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Takekawa (US 6,823,481).

10. As to claim 3, the combination of Sutton and Glaser discloses all of the claimed limitation of claim 1, except wherein the large format display is a high definition plasma display.

However, Takekawa discloses an electronic blackboard unit 4 including a large-sized PDP (Plasma Display Panel) 2 and a coordinate input/detection device 3 (see Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 60-66).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the plasma display panel (2) as disclosed by Takekawa with the large format display of the combination of Sutton and Glaser in order to achieve the benefit of intending to utilize in wide areas such as meeting, a presentation and an educational scene (see Takekawa, col. 2, lines 9-16), because this would improve the quality of a position of a light spot that have been touched on a screen more accurate without any recognition errors (see Takekawa, col. 3, lines 6-15).

11. As to claim 5, Sutton discloses the system of claim 3, wherein the large format collaboration display comprises:

Art Unit: 2629

a resizable display area [35, 36, 38]; a resizable real-time communications are for monitoring communications with other students at remote locations; a resizable collaboration area for sharing documents with other users [see col. 14, lines 47-56];

12. As to claim 6, Glaser discloses the system of claim 3, further comprising a plurality of input devices for simultaneous inputting signals from a plurality of users, wherein each input device comprises identifying indicia (corresponding to mouse/pointer icons) for identifying the user associated with the particular input device [see claim 1 above].

13. Claims 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sutton in view of Ogino.

14. As to claim 9, Sutton discloses a method for sharing information between a plurality of users though a large format collaborative display, the method comprising:

registering at least one user [enrolled student/user, col. 13, lines 14-16];

receiving at least one input signal from the registered user [navigating, clicking and dragging the slider (75) by the enrolled student, an alternate embodiment of Fig. 8C, col. 28, line 3-5];

displaying at least one document in the large format collaborative display in response to an input signal from the registered user [displaying the notes taken frame 66 for entering by the enrolled user/student while viewing an educational program, Fig. 8B, col. 18, lines 54-63];

associating at least one input device with each registered user [other input devices is used during selected periods the educational representation, col. 9, lines 7-

Art Unit: 2629

16. It would have been obvious to recognize that at least one of the other input devices associated with the enrolled student/user as claimed];

receiving an input signal through at least one input device in contact with a touch screen overlay placed on the large format collaborative display [entering/writing on digitizing board 22 while viewing an educational program, see Fig. 3, col. 10, lines 63 through col. 11, line 2];

storing the input signal in the document and associating the stored input signals with the registered user [storing the writing in the digital content of educational program associated with the student took notes in the storage device 24, see Fig. 3, col. 11, lines 3-12, and col. 18, lines 54-60];

sharing the stored document with at least one other user [notes taken frame 66 is sharing with the other user see Fig. 8B, col. 18, lines 54-63].

Accordingly, Sutton discloses all of the claimed limitation, except wherein the large format display comprises a resistive touch screen overlay.

However, Ogino discloses a large screen display which includes a conductive resistor film is added onto a light-transmission screen (see col. 5, lines 10-13). Ogino further discloses his present invention applying to a projection type LCD display (see col. 5, lines 27-34).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the large whiteboard display of Sutton to become the resistive touch screen as disclosed by Ogino in order to achieve the benefit of improving

Art Unit: 2629

the quality of the position pointing being touched more precise (see Ogino, col. 5, lines 43-45).

15. As to claim 10, Sutton discloses the method of claim 9, further comprising: displaying a video image of the user in at least a portion of the large format collaborative display [at least on notes taken frame 66 on the large display screen, see Fig. 8B, col. 18, lines 54-60].

16. As to claim 12, Sutton discloses the method of claim 10, further comprising displaying the video image of the registered user in at least a portion of the large format collaborative displays located at the remote sites in real-time [see Fig. 8C, col. 17, lines 10-27].

17. As to claim 13, Sutton discloses the method of claim 9, wherein the large format collaboration display comprises:

a resizable display area [35, 36, 38], a resizable real-time communications area for monitoring communications with other students at remote locations; a resizable collaboration area for sharing documents with other users [see col. 14, lines 47-56].

18. As to claim 15, Ogino discloses the method of claim 9, wherein the large format collaborative display is selected from a list consisting essentially of a liquid crystal display (LCD) [his present invention applied to a projection type LCD display, see col. 5, lines 27-34].

19. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sutton in view Ogino as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Takekawa.

The combination of Sutton and Ogino discloses all of the claimed limitation, except wherein the large format collaborative display is a high definition plasma display.

However, Takekawa discloses an electronic blackboard unit 4 including a large-sized PDP (Plasma Display Panel) 2 and a coordinate input/detection device 3 (see Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 60-66).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the plasma display panel (2) as disclosed by Takekawa with the large format display of Sutton and Ogino in order to achieve the benefit of intending to utilize in wide areas such as meeting, a presentation and an educational scene (see Takekawa, col. 2, lines 9-16), because this would improve the quality of a position of a light spot that have been touched on a screen more accurate without any recognition errors (see Takekawa, col. 3, lines 6-15).

20. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sutton in view of Ogino as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Platzker et al (US 6,388,654) hereinafter Platzker.

The combination of Sutton the Ogino discloses all of the claimed limitation, except for further comprising displaying the document in real time at another large format collaborative display at a remote location over a distributed network.

However, Platzker discloses another large format collaborative display [Writing/Projection Surface 21A, Fig. 1] which is linked by network [11] with another Writing/Projection Surface 21B for displaying collaboratively presentation aids in real time (see col. 5, lines 16-34 and col. 12, lines 50-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate displaying and communicating collaborative images on the Writing/Projection Surface 21A-21D linked via network [11] as disclosed by Platzker for the intended use of the combination of Sutton and Ogino, because the present invention is applied to remote presentation aids, in particular "whiteboards" such as those typically used in educational lectures and commercial sales and training settings, and in particular to remote whiteboards (see Platzker, abstract).

Conclusion

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN M. NGUYEN whose telephone number is 571-272-7697. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-THU from 8:00-6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, a supervisor RICHARD A. HJERPE can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8000.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the Patent Application Information Retrieval system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have questions on access to the

Application/Control Number: 10/680,761

Page 12

Art Unit: 2629

Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197
(toll-free).



Kevin M. Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2629

KMN
April 25, 2006